DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 452 892 JC 010 335

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Baker, George A., II |
| TITLE | American Higher Education at the Rubicon: A Partnership for Progress. |
| PUB DATE | 2001-00-00 |
| NOTE | 25p. |
| PUB TYPE | Opinion Papers (120) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01/PC01 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Community Colleges; Higher Education; Institutional Cooperation |

ABSTRACT

This paper provides a proposal that may help universities and community colleges support one another at a time when they are both testing the boundaries of their economic and intellectual resources. Critics agree that universities seem to have lost sight of their central purpose, and community colleges, in their growth, are now facing a massive need to replace aging faculty and administrators. Developing new credentialed administrators and faculty is a complex task and must involve several different organizations at the national, state, and local levels. With the American Association of Community Colleges (Washington, D.C.) at the helm, the federal and state governments, major associations, accreditation associations, and major foundations should contribute to the planning process. This paper attempts to analyze the human resource problem through three frames of reference, developed by the political analyst Graham Allison: (1) the rational actor; (2) the organizational process; and (3) bureaucratic politics. Using these as an organizational framework, the paper predicts how the organizations will behave and discusses how bureaucratic politics could be harnessed and focused at the national level to resolve the problems. (KS)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 452 892

Running head: AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION AT THE RUBICON

# American Higher Education at the Rubicon:

# A Partnership for Progress

George A. Baker, II

North Carolina State University

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

George A. Baker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

TC010335

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Amid debates over multiculturalism and political correctness, American higher education is beginning to test the boundaries of its economic and intellectual resources. Critics agree that, at the university end of the continuum, these organizations have lost sight of their central purpose. Meanwhile, at the other end of the continuum, community colleges that spread like ivy in the last quarter of the 20th century face a massive need to replace aging faculty and administrators. This paper provides a proposal that may help both of these giants to mutually support one another at a time when they are increasingly essential to our economy. Rationally, the only organization to meet the total needs of community colleges is the comprehensive university. Developing new credentialed administrators and faculty is a complex task and must involve several different organizations at the national, state, and local levels. With the American Association of Community Colleges at the helm, the federal and state governments, the major associations at One Dupont Circle, the accreditation associations, and major foundations should contribute to the planning processes. The author attempts to analyze the human resource problem through 3 frames of reference, developed by the political analyst Graham Allison (1971) to analyze major national crises such as the Cuban missile crisis of 1962. These frames are the Rational Actor, the Organizational Process, and Bureaucratic Politics. Using these as an organizational framework, the author predicts how the organizations will behave and discusses how bureaucratic politics could be harnessed and focused at the national level to resolve the problems.

American Higher Education at the Rubicon: A Partnership for Progress

In American higher education, much like the feudal culture of the Middle Ages, the administration oversees admissions and erects buildings, and the faculty retains authority over tenure decisions, teaching loads, and curricula (Wolfe, 1996). While this system has existed since the beginning of higher education in America, now, at the beginning of the 21st century, it is time to reevaluate its effectiveness in the vastly differing institutions existing today. There is little doubt that higher education is in trouble, but some higher education institutions are in more trouble than others (Finn and Manno, 1996). Those at the top—the elites, the Ivies, and a few state universities have very different situations and goals from those of public community colleges (Wolfe, 1996). The purpose of this paper is to develop a framework in which the large and powerful universities provide assistance and support to their poorer and less prestigious cousin—the American community college.

American higher education in the beginning of the twenty-first century stands on the banks of the Rubicon. Crossing over to the twenty-first century in the age of accountability and amidst a knowledge explosion is indeed fraught with uncertainty, but we are at the point of no return. Since the late 1960s, our campuses have become cauldrons of perpetual boil. The students' rebellions in the 1960s and 1970s have been followed by debates over multiculturalism and political correctness today. Critics claim that, while the American university is a perpetual growth machine, their community college cousins face the greatest turnover of their key players in their 100-year history. We must carpe diem or expect that the day will be seized by political forces who will, from a perspective that is politically expedient, attempt to create seamless educational systems beginning with preschool and continuing throughout the life of its citizens.

While American community colleges continue to struggle with identity, turnover, and mission focus, the university, secure in its role, seeks resources, growth, and power. University faculty seek greater autonomy, programs in all of higher education have become more and more specialized, and the escalation of tuition seems to have no economic bounds. Like Achilles, institutions of American higher education act as if their critics cannot find the vulnerable and unprotected heel. The Achilles heel of American higher education is discretionary funding and the increased movement toward performance-based decision making. In the age of growth in higher education, few funding agencies are allocating new dollars for college operations and student aid (Schmidt, 2000). While the various state legislatures march toward greater control, the accreditation agencies require the development of strategic planning. Meanwhile, the federal government targets more and more of its dollars toward financial aid for poorer and less fortunate Americans (Schmidt, 2000).

In the last half of the twentieth century, higher education opened its doors to the masses, served the GIs of World War II, underwrote a huge expansion and attempted to provide a skilled workforce for the greatest technological explosion the world had ever known. Regional colleges went national. Community colleges spread like the ivy that seldom graced their walls (Finn and Manno, 1996). Now, the great universities have largely abandoned emphasis on teaching and learning and have instead become engines of economic growth and hotbeds of technical and scientific progress as multinational corporations have invested research and development funds in communities of scholars and researchers. Today, our great universities are the world's postsecondary superpower, smashing the Gordian knots of growth and business cycles through power and politics. At the end of the twentieth century, there were 3,700 colleges in the United States, enrolling 15 million learners. Faculty approached one million and the entire industry

exceeded the gross national product of many Western European countries (Finn and Manno, 1996).

Notwithstanding the colossal nature of the enterprise today, higher education is beginning to test the limits of its economic and intellectual resources (Immerwahr, 1999; Merisotis & Wollanin, 1998). Critics aver that we seem to have lost our compass and sight of our central purpose. In the Wilson Quarterly, Allen Wolfe (1996) writes, "Radical change is the order of the day of American institutions…except in academia. The university seems to be sailing along, impervious to the forces buffeting the rest of society" (p. 34).

Chester Finn, Bruno Manno, and Alan Wolfe took the universities to task in the winter of 1996 issue of the Wilson Quarterly. Their respective articles describe the American university as an increasingly troubled enterprise, discussing the implications of admitting larger and larger numbers of under-prepared students, the mixed perceptions concerning the economic aspects of big-time athletics, an under-utilized professorate, and rising costs. Understandably, these issues lead policy makers to begin to be concerned about mission focus and performance. Other researchers argue that the economics of higher education has led to an environment where universities spend what they take in; in other words, they determine their own cost, set their own prices, operate with no clear objectives, and establish no clear measurable indicators of effectiveness. Meanwhile, state legislatures are forcing change through budget controls and performance funding. The question is to what extent pressure and incentives can be combined to create structures where the university can and will become a partner in resolving the major human resource needs of community college. Somewhere in these ivory towers exists a minority attempting to provide credentials to a group of students who seek advanced degrees while working for a living.

Community Colleges in Crisis

Not only is the community college movement at its celebration of 100 years, but it is also in crisis. Many community colleges were established as transfer institutions and have not been able to meet local needs in occupational and technical careers. Many community colleges now have a greater demand for evening and weekend programs and short course continuing education programs for working adults. Even in states where community colleges were established to support statewide economic development, state level funding is wed to full-time-student reimbursement. For many community colleges, Hobson's choice applies: choices of quality without growth and growth without quality are equally unacceptable (The Knowledge Net, AACC, 1999). In the faculty rankings matrix, salary schedules developed in the early days have resulted in in-step promotion and merit raises to the point where the state and the college must offer incentives to ease very comfortable faculty and staff into retirement.

In these environments, leadership is often unstable. In some cases, individuals and groups seek to remove sitting presidents by any means possible. Faculty often perceive that it is their collective role to send an exit message to the president through a vote of no confidence. Boards and board chairs often seek to usurp the authority of the president by making decisions that are outside their individual or collective charters (Baker, 1999-2000). While elected boards seem to be more politicized, appointed boards often appear less able to demonstrate sufficient commitment to govern the institution properly. Often presidents who are recent graduates of the various university preparation programs are thrown into complex political and organizational structures beyond their expertise and experience, thus losing the confidence of their boards and senior team leaders before they have had a chance to impact the quality and performance of the individuals and teams that they have been selected to lead (Baker, 1999-2000).

Leadership Issues

Climate studies conducted at the Univ[illegible]ty of Texas at Austin and North Carolina State University (Baker, et al., 1998-2000a & b, PACE and SACE studies) have resulted in the identification of several systemic and endemic problems community college leaders across the nation face on a continuing basis (see Table 1). During calendar year 1999-2000, thirty-five organizational culture studies were completed in American community colleges. Dissatisfaction levels were measured on a Likert-type five-point scale. From a leadership perspective, faculty, staff, and administrators were increasingly dissatisfied when considering their personal ability to influence the directions of the college and the extent to which the culture was positively motivating performance.

From an organizational structure perspective, community college personnel were relatively dissatisfied with the way the college was organized and where (at what level) decisions were made in the college. From a communication perspective, personnel were most dissatisfied with the extent to which open and ethical communication was practiced and the extent to which information was shared within the college. From a team perspective, community college faculty, staff, and administrators were most dissatisfied with a lack of cohesiveness and the extent to which teams were involved in decision making. Generally, individuals were most satisfied with their ability to manage their own work assignments and with the technology provided to them (mean score 3.74), but were dissatisfied with opportunities for advancement and with the extent to which administrative procedures were clearly defined. Table 1 can easily be translated into a list of leadership competencies that should be central foci in a community college leadership program (Baker, 1998-2000).

Since 1990, the National Initiative for Leadership and Institutional Effectiveness (NILIE) has conducted climate studies for more than 250 community colleges. The ten concepts reported in Table 1 have remained constant for these past ten years. It is reasonable to assume that these ten issues are endemic across the continuum of community colleges in America (Baker, 1998-2000). Cultural research of the nature reported herein supports a conclusion that communit college training programs must build their preparation programs around the issues of leadership and management with clear emphases on communication, collaboration, organizational structure, and work design and technology.

The student focus section of the instrument aims to measure satisfaction with the several mission components of a comprehensive community college. Individual mission components are evaluated on a range from a low of 3.40 on the extent to which leaders support the mission to a high of 3.94 on the overall extent to which students receive a quality education. As might be expected, community college personnel rate the "extent to which students receive a quality education" equal to their evaluation of the extent to which they control their own work (work design) (3.75 on a scale of 1-5) (Baker, et al., 1998-2000a & b, PACE and SACE studies, p. 13).

Faculty Attitudes

Based on NILIE studies conducted during the decade of the 1990s, faculty attitudes essentially have not changed. Of the three groups studied, faculty remained significantly more dissatisfied than either administrators or support staff. Cohen and Brawer (1996) wrote that community college faculty have generally negative attitudes toward community college culture, characterized by adversarial relationships with boards and administrators relating to work conditions and salary. While faculty experience high levels of burnout, leaving the college for other employment is generally not an option (Cohen & Brawer, 1996). These researchers

summarize the problem as follows: faculty no longer look to the university for applicable concepts in curriculum and instruction, instead creating their own culture, socializing new members into what has become a career, albeit an uncomfortable and relatively psychologically debilitating one. Rifkin (1999) writes that, as a large number of current faculty members begin to retire, new, qualified, and dedicated faculty will be needed to replace them. Strong links to the labor market in both academic and occupational areas will allow community colleges to replace them, but with negative attitudes toward the community college culture, the university may not be the best place to cultivate and grow new faculty. Cohen and Brawer (1996) claim that, while working in the community college, faculty are subjected to the formal and technical culture of the workplace and that this work shapes their behavior. It seems clear that it is the community college's responsibility to recruit, train, retain, and renew the next generation of community college teachers, ideally in conjunction with their university partners, and on their own turf. Community colleges neither have the resources nor do they have the mission to train and credential administrators and faculty. The university systems have both the resources and the programs to meet our needs.

Synthesis of the Frames of Reference

We seek a solution to the problem where the community colleges of America will require a significant number of credentialed administrative leaders and community college faculty in the immediate future. While it is obvious that community colleges and other higher education institutions must work together as partners to resolve both external and internal challenges, the litmus test must be a fair and equal distribution of resources. One of the major issues in resolving this problem is to determine at what level of government this issue could be resolved and, from this writer's perspective, the single point of focus for community colleges must be the American

Association of Community Colleges (AACC). Organizations affected directly by the issue would be community colleges in the various states. Program designers should be the various community college state level systems in partnership with the appropriate universities or university systems. At some point, a decision would need to be made regarding states without community college systems or states without university systems; this, however, is not an overwhelming obstacle, as there exist many different approaches to resolve this and other issues. In this writer's best estimate, a synthesis of concepts could provide a rational and organizational approach that would be acceptable to policy makers and the resource allocation level in an existing state.

The fundamental method employed in the rational actor analysis is what is often called vicarious problem solving. Here we look at the problem that we seek to solve with the assumption that we have developed a reasonable solution to a strategic problem. Our goal is to establish a national resource development program for the training and preparation of community college administrators and faculty.

The best way to achieve this goal is through a task force. As stated earlier, the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) would be the central focus for the development of a national plan to train and provide credentials for community college administrators. Foundations such as Kellogg, Ford, and Carnegie would be asked to participate in the process. Higher education agencies such as the American Council for Education, the American Association for Higher Education, and the Education Commissions of the States would be partners in the proposal and in the problem-solving policies. State community college system presidents, commissioners, or directors would be involved. Federal agencies such as the Departments of Education and Labor should also be players. Additionally, for purposes of changing or restructuring the credentials process, the six accreditation associations would be

partners in the national model. In order to deal with the issues effectively, two or more levels of decision making and policy development could be involved. The first level would contain major agency heads, and second-level players might be divided into accreditation regions or according to geographic regions.

The AACC should be assisted by someone such as Presidents Carter or Clinton who with major political clout, acting as titular head, would lead in the development of a national governmental policy. This policy would be expected to impact various aspects of national and state government. Consultants who have major experience in policy development could be helpful in developing national plans that impact essentially all fifty states.

The Consequences

The outcomes of the effort would be the development of programs within the university systems to support graduate-level programs for working community college administrators and faculty. Since few programs structured to produce community college leaders and faculty currently exist, the legislature would provide targeted resources into a single university center to support the onsite delivery of instruction to the various community colleges to support their administrators and faculty. The community college research and teaching centers would typically be organized under the university's graduate school and would be able to draw on various teaching resources across the campus. For community college leadership programs, maximum use of state and community college leaders could be employed. For faculty accreditation, associations would be involved in developing curriculum to support both the discipline and teaching skills and competencies. In both cases, maximum use could be made of distance learning and credit for appropriate experience, especially in the area of technical, occupational and vocational curricula.

The output of the Task Force at AACC would result in national policy necessary to support legislative and higher education institutions in the various states. Federal funds could be applied to match state and local funding and could be proportioned according to need. Major foundations would be requested to support the national efforts with planning and start-up funds in states choosing to participate in the project.

Toward a Model: A Partnership for Progress

From the introduction to this article, it should be clear that any attempt to have universities and university systems to serve community colleges on their terms and subsequently on their turf would be met with significant resistance. From a cultural perspective, community college advocates need to learn what buttons to push and which levers to pull. From a macro perspective, these leaders must discover how to go about transforming the culture of the university to provide resources to support the development of community college faculty and administrators. From the community college perspective, we must create a culture in which community college leaders accept responsibility to develop their own faculty and other staff, and, from a national perspective, we must marshal the power, expertise, and resources to create policy that will lead to a resolution of this vexing human resource development conundrum. It is the assumption of this writer that a community college and university partnership is a national issue and can only be resolved at the national level. Currently dean of the John F. Kennedy School at Harvard, Graham Allison (1971) has developed frameworks for analyzing complex national problems, creating three case studies to explain the Cuban missile crisis of 1962. His ability to assess the problem from a rational, organizational, and political framework provides other decision makers insights into solving a complex social, organizational, and political problem such as the one outlined above. Just as money, political actors, organizational cultures,

and perceptions colored the Cuban missile crisis in 1962, so also do similar forces color and impact the solution to the university-community college partnership issue today.

Space does not allow for the total and complex analysis necessary to tweak out possible scenarios for evaluation. Thus, a large canvas will be offered and broad strokes of insight will be developed in this article. It will be left for a national task force to make recommendations necessary to help structure and resolve this complex problem. The following discussion springs from Allison's three models.

The Rational Actor Model

The assumption of the rational frame of reference is that a national task force can proceed to resolve the problem from a straightforward, informal, and non-theoretical fashion (Allison, 1971), and this national team can proceed from a rationally developed framework. Here, we would expect the One Dupont Circle leaders (ACT, AAHE, and others), headed by the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), to develop an organizational framework of policies with incentives, rewards, and sanctions that would result in the university state systems' providing curriculum and degrees that allow them to meet the needs of community colleges. The solution would allow community colleges to replace current leaders with individuals who have been prepared to be successful in working with adults in the community college arena.

We would expect that the large foundations, such as Kellogg, Ford, Carnegie, and others, would provide at least on a seeding basis the funds to support programming and associated efforts in the university and in community colleges. We would also expect the accreditation agencies to support these efforts with maximum flexibility especially in areas of credit for prior experience and when, how, and where courses would be offered to meet the needs of working professionals. Further, we would expect that the community college systems would work with

funding agencies to provide resources directly to appropriate agencies involved in the resolution of these professional preparation programs. A policy similar to that adopted by the state of Florida where a percentage of resources are reserved for professional development activities would increase commitment and motivation for professional faculty and administrators to participate in the programs.

To resolve the problem, the Rational Actor Model would be employed to predict how the various leaders and their organizations would develop in advance of the strategic goals and operating objectives to be attained through partnerships necessary to resolve the professional development problem for community colleges.

The Organizational Model

The assumption of the organizational frame of reference is that when several organizations work jointly to solve problems, the outcomes anticipated in the Rational Model are complicated through the need to divide responsibilities and to assign them to various agencies, and that agencies will seek to become involved only to a limited degree, and that each organization will attempt to resolve the problem through existing programs and options as opposed to building the necessary response through new learning. Simon (1964) lists five characteristic deviations from the Rational Model that must be controlled in order to experience success in a joint organizational issue. These are factored problems, satisficing, limited search, dealing with uncertainty, and existing repertoires.

If the task force and its leaders develop a proposal based on rational analysis, the issues involved will be so complex that only a limited number of issues can be dealt with simultaneously. Therefore, the structure of different objectives assigned to each unit must be evaluated at the national level. This analysis can often be done by matrix structures or other

project management techniques. A national problem of the magnitude discussed in this paper will be subjected to a phenomenon where all alternatives will not be fully explored and will often result in something less than the acceptable courses of action. The problem of satisficing will be especially prevalent in the program level where individuals may not be prepared to accommodate changes necessary to deliver on the program. The need to establish in universities a new center at the graduate school level could control some major satisficing problems. At the higher education level, both the community college's and university's search for effective solutions will be limited, as actors tend to develop relatively stable and uncomplicated solutions. When a new program is announced, it is typically seen as an add-on instead of a replacement for an existing program. University provosts or graduate school deans will need to be placed in a position to provide resources and to supervise the programs designed to remedy the problem. According to Simon (1964), organizations seek to predict with certainty as opposed to providing estimates of future outcomes. Thus, like thermostats, they rely on prompt corrective action to eliminate deviations rather than seeking long-range solution. The national planning resulting in legislative action and targeted resources will help to reduce uncertainty and increase the probability of success. We can expect that when components of the program are assigned to various organizations, existing programs will be applied to new needs and the range of choice deemed acceptable will fall on a continuum of recurring and predictable solutions. A new community college research and faculty development center could result in new organizational structures, policies, procedures, and curricula delivered in new ways.

In the design of programs and policies to accommodate the current and future needs of America's community colleges, the planners at AACC will need to respond to and control Simon's (1964) typical deviations from a systematically derived plan; some of these concerns

follow. To offset the tendency of the colleges and universities involved to split up aspects of the problem inappropriately, the design team will need to articulate clearly and precisely the objectives to be accomplished by each partner in the process. In this regard, a formative and summative evaluation model must be developed. The evaluation criteria must be quantitative and verifiable to the maximum extent possible. Needless to say, where resources are committed to accomplish objectives, evaluation must be systematic and thorough.

The issue of satisficing is typical in group activities where decision processes are neither understood nor used and where individuals and organizations are not held to a high standard of performance. In research studies where participants are provided with structured decision processes, strong personality factors or perceptual defenses can lead to consensus decisions where the democratic rule of 51% is applied. These situations seldom yield the best quality results.

The tendency of limited search is practiced by most decision makers. Limited time available to decide is the best friend of the status quo. Problem solving and decision making involving the issue under analysis will require real experts not only with the knowledge and experience to develop the plan, but also with a temperament to support shared responsibilities in decision making.

The need to deal with uncertainty will be a major issue in resolving issues such as a national program to develop leaders and faculty for community colleges. Under strong leadership, the rewards and incentives for participating in the program, plus the temperaments of the planners can overcome the tendency to avoid major commitments of time and energy. In order to prevent a plan with a limited menu, perhaps top-level leaders in lieu of their representatives should be considered.

Repertoires in a scheme so grand as to resolve major problems for over 1100 organizations cannot be pieces and parts with no central heart. One of the reasons to go to the national level would be to amass the talent and the resources to attack the problem with real clout. Members of the national task force should be selected for their expertise and their demonstrated commitment to the community college movement. Players who seek to enhance their own reputations will not provide a great deal of expertise in resolving an extremely complex and pervasive problem.

A caveat to the rational leadership model is the fact that an organization such as a college or university consists of a conglomerate of semi-feudal, loosely coupled sub-units, each with its own sub-culture and with a substantial set of priorities all its own. Organizational behavior experts see executive leaders sitting formally on top of a conglomerate (Allison 1971). Rather than acting rationally, each part of the organization attends to a special set of problems and acts to maximize its own resources. In these public sector settings, leaders are seen as able to disturb, but not substantially to control individual and group behavior in these organizations. Especially daunting in this environment is the challenge to get one organization to work with another in the same constellation.

The Political Model

In Allison's (1971) third frame, Organizational Politics, leaders are not a monolithic group; rather each member of the constellation becomes a player in a central, competitive game. The name of the game is politics. Players bargain for resources and power along both vertical and horizontal lines and, thus, the output of this group is the result of serious bargaining and, as such, trigger what Simon (1964) called "bounded rationality," characterized by satisficing,

limited search for solutions to problems, and the application of programmed solutions to non-structured problems.

Allison (1971) concludes in his analysis of the Cuban missile crisis that strategic or operational problems must be analyzed through all three frames. While we can view each frame separately, a synthesis will provide a straight, focused, razor-sharp solution. To lead organizations, leaders must be trained to employ strategic planning to deal with long-term and systemic change and to employ operational planning to establish systems and procedures for carrying out the mission, vision, goals, and objectives of the organization. We prepare leaders to understand organizational behavior, to understand how to influence the quality and quantity of the activities of the individuals and groups integral to carrying out organizational purpose, and finally, we prepare our higher education leaders to understand and apply influence in a political environment where positional power is often not a sufficient force to devise a satisfactory solution. Increasingly, the skill and adroitness necessary to carry out operational and strategic decisions that will affect a constellation of organizations, such as that of higher education in America, must be a part of leadership training.

At this crucial juncture, community colleges require new leaders to replace the large number of retiring CEOs and members of the senior leadership team. Secondly, community colleges must also replace retiring faculty with a new cadre of individuals who have been prepared to teach in a community college setting. Complicating this problem is the fact that community colleges across America exist in various forms and sizes under varying governance models and state systems and in various stages of growth and development. A community college in southern West Virginia may be relatively young but experiencing population loss in the service area at a rate of five to ten percent per year, while another college in north Georgia or

central Arizona may be gaining new accessions in the range of fifteen to twenty percent in a single year.

A Priori Caveat

Let's assume that the state and national forces such as AACC and their One Dupont Circle Colleagues along with accreditation agencies could develop policies and procedures that would result in community colleges and their university counterparts organizing programs that would result in providing credentials for administrators and faculty sufficient to meet the pressing needs of community colleges to replace anticipated losses. Essential to such programs would be the management of Simon's faux pas.

State legislatures could allocate resources to the university system to provide for the establishment of a community college research center. Funding would allow for the development of continuing education programs to be operated by various academic departments or under the control of the graduate school. Both development funds and enhanced graduate full-time equivalent credits could be authorized. Policy makers would need to structure the problem with sufficient uncertainties to prevent or control Simon's (1964) five deadly sins (factored problems, satisficing, limited search, organization deviations, and the application of existing repertoires).

The university would need to find new ways to create a home for doctoral degrees for administrators, and master's degrees for faculty to meet the requirements of accreditation agencies. Today, no existing college or academic department controls the curriculum or faculty expertise necessary to offer a doctor of education degree with heavy emphasis in leadership and management, and in the current organization, no college or academic department is structured to deliver the teaching methods and psychology courses along with the courses in an academic discipline necessary to meet the accreditation requirements.

Since the academic programs necessary to credential community college administration and faculty would be offered at times and places to accommodate working adults, nontraditional delivery means would be necessary. North Carolina supports 59 community colleges across over 600 miles from eastern to western boundaries. The University of North Carolina system assigned North Carolina State University the responsibility to deliver the programs and University of North Carolina-Asheville as the location for its Western cohort. The executive program at UNC-A is limited to doctoral students and is delivered three ways. One-third of the curriculum is delivered by satellite from NC State, another third by UNC-Asheville, and the final portion in short mini-semester formats at NC State during the summer months. A similar model could be developed for other states.

Summar

The purpose of this paper is to consider ways to resolve what is rapidly becoming a major concern for the 1100 American community colleges. In this context, the major question is how does America go about tasking one element of higher education to support and commit to another major segment, given that the two components currently exist in a competitive environment in which both the major universities and the community colleges fight for scarce resources with K-12 systems. This paper is designed to analyze why the problem will be so difficult to resolve, but how the proper forces brought to bear under the right conditions could overcome governments' difficulty in dealing with seminal events fraught with misunderstanding, misexpectation, and resistance to change.

This author assumes that a problem of this nature must be resolved at the national level. A second assumption is that the problem must be resolved by the leaders of the major organizations involved, even though the actual problem and programs may be developed at the

working level, or in this case, at the university and community college system levels. Allison's three models—the rational actor, organizational, and political—were employed as a means of understanding how to go about solving a complex problem of major import to a segment of American higher education charged with lower division transfer programs, building the workforce, and life-long education and skill building at the local community level.

Tinto, et al. (1993) argue that universities are not yet learning organizations. Neither are community colleges. Were both of these major educational entities learning organizations, the would have resolved this intra-organizational problem long ago. Relationships would have been established at the state and organizational level so that K-16 would exist as a well-oiled seamless educational enterprise structured in a way to produce the workers, citizens, professionals, and leaders for the greatest democracy the world has ever known.

References

Allison, G. (1971). Essence of decision explaining the Cuban missile crisis. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company.

Baker, G. (1999). Building the comprehensive community college. The Community College Journal, 69(4), 33-38.

Baker, G. (1999-2000). Leadership studies conducted at North Carolina State University Under contract to various community college systems and boards (confidential). Raleigh, NC: North Carolina State University.

Baker, G., et al. (1998-2000a). Personal assessment of the college environment (PACE). (reports by the National Initiative for Leadership and Institutional Effectiveness). Raleigh, NC: North Carolina State University College of Education.

Baker, G., et al. (1998-2000b). Student assessment of the college environment (SACE). (reports by the National Initiative for Leadership and Institutional Effectiveness). Raleigh, NC: North Carolina State University College of Education.

Cohen, A., & Brawer, F. (1996). The American community college. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Drucker, P. (1999). Management challenges for the 21st century. New York: HarperCollins.

Finn, C., & Manno, B. (1996). Behind the curtain. The Wilson Quarterly 20(1), 44-53

Immerwahr, J. (1999). Taking responsibility: Leaders' expectations of higher education. (National Center Report No. 99-1). New York: The National Center for Public Policy and Public Agenda.

Keim, M. (Ed.). (1992). Directory of graduate preparation programs in community college education. Washington, D.C.: Council of Universities and Colleges. An affiliated Council of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Merisotis, J. & Wolanin, (1998). Community college financing: Strategies and challenges for the coming decade. Washington, DC: The Institute for Higher Education Policy.

Rifkin, T. (1999). Portrait of the faculty at public community colleges at the turn of the century. New Expeditions White Paper. Washington, DC: AACC.

Schmidt, P. (2000, December 15). State higher education funds rise overall, but growth slows in much of nation. The Chronicle of Higher Education, A34-35.

Simon, H. (1964). On the concept of organizational goals. Administrative Science Quarterly, 9, 1-22.

The AACC & ACCT Executive Committees. (2000). The knowledge net connecting communities, learners, and colleges: A report of the new expeditions initiative. Washington, DC: The Community College Press.

Tinto, V., Goodsell, L., & Russo, P. (1993). Building learning communities for new college students. University Park, PA: National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning, and Assessment, Pennsylvania State U.

Wolfe, A. (1996). The feudal culture of the postmodern community. The Wilson Quarterly, 20 (1), 54-66.

Table 1

Dissatisfaction Issues in Institutional Culture

N=11,264; Collected January to December 2000; Institution N=35

| Rank | Issue | Issue Mean | Standard Deviation | Domain | Domain Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Q. 35: Level of decision making | *2.90 | 1.160 | Structure | 3.41 |
| 2 | Q. 34: Proper organization | *3.05 | 1.135 | Structure | 3.41 |
| 3 | Q. 9: Ability to influence | *3.06 | 1.092 | Leadership | 3.66 |
| 4 | Q. 17: Open and ethical communication | *3.08 | 1.195 | Communication | 3.40 |
| 5 | Q. 24: Spirit of cooperation | *3.10 | 1.151 | Collaboration | 3.50 |
| 6 | Q. 19: Information shared | *3.11 | 1.131 | Communication | 3.40 |
| 7 | Q. 40: Opportunities for advancement | *3.12 | 1.203 | Work design and technology | 3.12 |
| 8 | Q. 23: Teams for decision making | *3.21 | 0.982 | Collaboration | 3.50 |
| 9 | Q. 41: Quality of processes | *3.25 | 1.089 | Work design and technology | 3.74 |
| 10 | Q. 10: Organization is motivational | *3.29 | 1.089 | Leadership | 3.65 |

*p>.001 when comparing Issue Mean to Domain Mean